

## REMARKS

The Office Action of October 12, 2006 has been received and its contents carefully considered.

Turning first to the claim objections in sections 4 and 6 of the Office Action, the present Amendment revises claim 1 to refer to first and second web contents. It also revises claim 3 to specify the first web content and claim 4 to specify the second web content. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3 and 4 are no longer substantial duplicates, so the objection should be withdrawn.

The present Amendment also cancels claim 6, so the objection to that claim is now moot.

Section 7 rejects various claims for indefiniteness. The present Amendment cancels claim 23, so the rejection of this claim is now moot. The remaining claims rejected in section 7 have been revised, in view of the comments in the Office Action, and it is respectfully submitted that they are now suitably definite under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

Section 9 of the Office Action rejects claims 6-14 and 20-28 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101. The present Amendment cancels claims 6-9 and 20-23, so the rejection is moot with respect to these claims. The Amendment also revises independent claims 10 and 24 to recite a translation step from a first language into a second language. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the inventions now defined by claims 10 and 24 represent practical applications within the technological arts, so the rejection for non-statutory subject matter should be withdrawn.

The present Amendment cancels the claims rejected for anticipation in section 10 of the Office Action, so this rejection is also now moot.

Section 12 of the Office Action rejects independent claims 1, 10, 15, and 24 (along with various dependent claims) for obviousness based on US patent 6,823,362 to Eshghi in view of US patent 6,405,219 to Saether et al. This latter reference will hereafter be called simply "Saether" for the sake of convenient discussion. For the reasons discussed below it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims, as currently formulated, are patentable over these references.

AMENDMENT

10/804,129

Claim 1 now provides that primary and secondary servers have web content that is in different languages. Claim 1 now also recites "...and coding the updated web content file of each secondary server by dynamically linking to the language code setting of that secondary server" and "translating the updated web content file of each secondary server from the first language into [a] respective one of the second languages."

The Eshghi reference observes (at column 2, lines 14-19, in the "Background" section of Eshghi) that "[e]ach of the content files is typically in the HTML (Hyper-Text Markup Language) web page format. The updating engine 24 then sends the updated version of the content file to each of the content servers 23-23n to replace the older version. This completes the update process for the content file." An ordinarily skilled person who had read the reference would understand that Eshghi is only interested in transmitting updated versions of each HTML files for updating older versions. The invention defined by claim 1, in contrast, codes an updated web content file by dynamically linking to a language code setting for each secondary server.

At the middle of page 7, the Office Action acknowledges that Eshghi does not teach a coding language. For this, the Office Action turns to the Saether reference, and relies in part on the passage at Saether's column 2, lines 51-58 (in the "Background" section of the reference). This passage states that Saether's source file may include various different types of files, including an "application program code." It is respectfully submitted, though, that Saether's "application program code" is not the same as "the language code setting of each secondary server" as specified in claim 1.

On page 8, the Office Action comments with regard to claims 2 and 16 that "the combination of Eshghi and Saether et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitation further comprising translating the updated web content file from a language used on the primary server into a specific language used on the secondary server," and cites the passage at column 5 of Eshghi, line 29 to column 6, line 18 in support of this assertion. Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion in the Office Action. The cited passage of Eshghi (beginning at line 29 of column 5) does not disclose the concept of translating an updated web content file.

Since the Saether reference does not disclose this concept, either, it will be apparent that the combination of these references could not disclose the concept.

The remaining independent claims also refer to coding and translation, and are therefore patentable over the references just like claim 1.

The rest of the claims are dependent claims, and recite additional limitations to further define the invention. They are therefore patentable along with their independent claims and need not be further discussed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood

Registration No. 28,134

Customer No. 23995

(202) 326-0222 (telephone)

(202) 408-0924 (facsimile)

AW/ng

AMENDMENT

10/804,129